

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-6419**

---

EMANUEL IZUCHUKWU IBEZIM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GEORGE K. MCKINNEY; JANE A. DOE; JANE B. DOE;  
JANE C. DOE; JOHN D. DOE; JOHN E. DOE; JOHN F.  
DOE; JOHN G. DOE; JOHN H. DOE; JOHN I. DOE;  
WILLIAM JEDNORSKI; JOHN PRICE; DANNY MCCOY;  
DOCTOR EMBASSY; DOCTOR MANNING; JOHN J. DOE;  
JOHN K. DOE; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TOLLIVER;  
JOHN L. DOE; JOHN M. DOE; JOHN N. DOE; JOHN O.  
DOE; JOHN P. DOE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Chief District Judge.  
(CA-99-1-JFM)

---

Submitted: July 13, 2000

Decided: July 24, 2000

---

Before WIDENER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Emanuel Izuchukwu Ibezim, Appellant Pro Se. Lynne Ann Battaglia, United States Attorney, Nadira Clarke, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland; John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Sharon Stanley Street, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Emmanuel I. Ibezim appeals the district court's order granting the Appellees' motion for summary judgment and dismissing his civil rights complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's memorandum and find no reversible error in the court's conclusion that the prison medical staff was not deliberately indifferent to his medical needs.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Ibezim v. McKinney, No. CA-99-1-JFM (D. Md. Feb. 17, 2000).<sup>2</sup> We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibezim waived review of his remaining claims because he did not address them in his informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b).

<sup>2</sup> Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on February 16, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on February 17, 2000. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was physically entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).